Application TLV Thoughts

Joe Pelissier

az-pelissier-applicationtlv-thoughts-0309

Background

- **The application TLV provides an indication of which priority should be used for which protocols**

    e.g. Please put iSCSI on Priority 5

- **It makes sense for a bridge to provide this information to an end station**

    Provides basic boot information without requiring the end station to contact the network management entity

- **Does this make sense in any other case?**

    More specifically, does it make sense for any device to configure its application to priority assignments for any case other than bridge to end station

Application TLV: Endstation to Bridge

- **What would a bridge do with this?**

    The bridge does not create any traffic, so it never needs to stick a priority on a frame

    The bridge may re-map priorities, but this is based on priority, *not* application or protocol

    Expanding to this seems to go far beyond any of our PARs

Application TLV: Other cases

- **Bridge to Bridge**

  Again, bridges do not generate traffic. I do not believe we want to invent a capability to remap priorities based on protocol

- **End Station to End Station**

  A two node network is a bit outside the scope of DCB. There seems little benefit to adding any complexity to support this case.

Application TLV: Recommendation

- **Add a bit that indicates if the source of the TLV is a bridge.**

- **An end station receiving an Application TLV from a bridge is permitted to use the data in the TLV to configure its protocol to priority associations**

    In all other cases, it is prohibited to use the data in the received TLV to configure the protocol to priority associations.

Thank You!